



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,204	04/02/2001	Michael R. Dressendorfer	D0117	1217

7590 08/12/2002

George J. Netter, Esq.
LAW OFFICES OF GEORGE J. NETTER
260 So. Los Robles Ave., #216
Pasadena, CA 91101

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, GERALD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3637

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	DRESSENDORFER ET AL.
Examiner JERRY A ANDERSON	Art Unit 3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) f are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ .
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, drawn to the overhead roller construction and the cabinet construction of a cabinet assembly, classified in class 312, subclass 334.26.
- II. Claims 8-14, drawn to the drawer construction in a cabinet assembly, classified in class 312, subclass 348.3.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions group I and group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, Group I has separate utility such as a cabinet with overhead rollers supporting a drawer without shelves and Group II can be used as the drawer of Gemma. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Netter on 3 August 2002 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-7. Applicant in replying to this Office action must make affirmation of this election. Claims 8-14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim 1 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising Figure 1 and Figure 14. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 has cited the references, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The language of the claims must clearly distinguish the elements of the claims. Therefore the ends of must be clearly distinguished. Terms which make the claims indefinite include: "being formed toward each other providing curved holders" in claim 1 might become -- formed facing each other to provide curved holders --, "any cabinet assembly" in claim 2 may become – the cabinet assembly --, "the same side of the stanchion lying in the same rotational plane" in claim 4 may become – two rollers, one of each pair, on one side of the stanchion and in the same rotational plane --. Terms in the claims which lack proper antecedent basis include: "the drawers", "" in claim 1, line 2.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: a "stop arm" is only a stop if it engages some other structure.

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, as presented, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gemma and further in view of Ziegler et al and the ordinary skill of one versed in the art. Gemma shows a cabinet assembly with overhead tracks, roller supported drawers and a stop 31, 32 and 34. In Gemma part of the stop 31, 32 is attached to the cabinet and part 34 is a flange of the roller truck. Since it is well settled in case law that a reversal of parts is an obvious matter of design choice the attaching of a stop part to the truck is within the ability of one having an ordinary skill in the art. Gemma fails to show a pair of four-wheel trucks guided by a track with curved holders. Ziegler is cited showing another cabinet assembly with overhead tracks guiding drawers with two four-wheel trucks for the purpose of providing stabilize weight distribution of the drawers. Generally the shape and size of an element is considered an obvious matter of design choice. Here the width of the drawers defined in claim 2 is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice within the ability of one having an ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Gemma with four wheel trucks guided by curved holders for the purpose of providing stabilize weight distribution of the drawers in view of Ziegler, with a stop part

attached to the truck or stanchion and any useful width of drawer as an obvious matter of design choice for one having an ordinary skill in the art.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tourtellier et al and Richard.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Anderson whose telephone number is 703 038 2202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703 308 24668. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3597 for regular communications and 703 306 4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 2197.

Jaa
August 5, 2002



GERALD A. ANDERSON
PATENT EXAMINER